

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

DEREK TUCSON, ROBIN SNYDER,  
MONSIEREE DE CASTRO, and ERIK  
MOYA-DELGADO,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY OF SEATTLE, ALEXANDER  
PATTON, TRAVIS JORDAN, DYLAN  
NELSON, RYAN KENNARD, MIA  
NGUYEN, JAMISON MAEHLER,  
NICHOLAS GREGORY, RYAN  
BARRETT, and MICHELE LETIZIA,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C23-17 MJP

ORDER DENYING STIPULATED  
MOTION TO FILE OVERLENGTH  
BRIEF

This matter comes before the Court on the Parties' "Stipulated Motion to File Overlength Brief." (Dkt. No. 75.) Having reviewed the Stipulated Motion and all supporting materials, and after obtaining clarification from the Parties via email, the Court DENIES the Motion.

1 Through the Stipulated Motion, the Parties seek a 12,600-word limit—a 50% increase  
2 over the limit set by the Local Civil Rules—for dispositive motions. (Stip. Mot. at 2 (Dkt. No.  
3 75).) With clarification received from the Parties via email, the Court understands that both  
4 Parties intend to file summary judgment motions, but only Defendants seek leave to file an  
5 overlength brief in support of their motion for summary judgment. Plaintiffs have stipulated to  
6 the request for additional briefing, but do not seek more pages for their own motion. In support  
7 of the request for additional briefing, the Parties report that “there are four plaintiffs who have  
8 each asserted thirty-six claims against nine separate defendants” and that “[e]ach of these claims  
9 must be examined individually.” (*Id.* at 1-2.) They believe a 12,600-word limit is “more  
10 appropriate for adequately addressing the multiplicity of claims and promote judicial economy  
11 by potentially reducing the scope of matters tried to the jury.” (*Id.* at 2.)

12 The Court does not find good cause to allow additional pages of briefing. As the Court  
13 understands the Second Amended Complaint, Plaintiffs present only four causes of action  
14 concerning the same municipal ordinance and its application to the four plaintiffs. (Dkt. No. 64.)  
15 While there may be complexity in the legal issues, the claims present overlapping legal issues,  
16 and the factual issues appear straight-forward. And while the Court understands how the Parties  
17 calculate the total number of claims (multiplying the four claims against each of the nine  
18 defendants), it does not find that this numeric measure an accurate reflection of the complexity or  
19 the need for additional briefing. Additionally, because the Parties intend on filing competing  
20 motions for summary judgment, the Parties will have ample space within the normal limits set by  
21 the Local Rules to address the legal and factual issues. The Court therefore DENIES the Motion.

22 \\\

23 \\\

24

1 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

2 Dated February 27, 2024.

3 

4 Marsha J. Pechman  
5 United States Senior District Judge  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24